DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 516 EC 103 589

TITLE	The Individualized Education Program: Key to an Appropriate Education for the Handicapped Child. 1977 Annual Report.
INSTITUTION	National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	77
NOTE	46p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock No. 017-080-01699-1)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adapted Physical Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Legislation; *Handicapped Children; *Individualized Programs; Inservice Teacher Education; Recreation; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	Education For All Handicapped Children Act; *Individualized Education Programs

ABSTRACT

The 1977 annual report of the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped focuses on implementation of individualized education programs (IEPs) for handicapped children, as mandated in P.L. 94-142, the Education For All Handicapped Children Act. Five recommendations are made, including the recommendation for increased appropriation for inservice teacher education. Issues involved in implementing the IEP concept are reviewed; considerations in teacher education and training are discussed; and the role of physical education, recreation, and leisure in formation of IEPs is described. Examined is the IEP process at two institutions: the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, and the Model Secondary School for the Deaf. Cited are excerpts on the IEP from P.L. 94-142, Senate and House colloquys, and special congressional reports. A final section reviews the status of the Committee's 1976 recommendations. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED149516

THE INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM: Key to an Appropriate Education for the Handicapped Child

1977 Annual Report National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EC 10 58

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Joseph A. Califano, Jr., Secretary
Mary Frances Berry, Assistant Secretary for Education
Office of Education
Ernest L. Boyer, Commissioner

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1977

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402
Stock Number 017-080-01699-1

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE HANDICAPPED
400 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

April 11, 1977

The Honorable Ernest L. Boyer
U.S. Commissioner of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Commissioner Boyer:

Among the noteworthy provisions of the Public Law 94-142 amendments to the Education of the Handicapped Act was the requirement that each handicapped child's education be conducted in consonance with an individualized education plan.

The individualized approach can of course be a valuable strategy in the schooling of all children, but it is particularly important for those with handicaps, for it provides a basis for assuring that each child will be enabled to learn in the circumstances and manner best suited to that child's particular needs.

Given the importance of the individualized education program concept, the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped devoted all meetings of its 1976-77 term to an examination of this important teaching tool. Our 1977 Annual Report, entitled "The Individualized Education Program--Key to an Appropriate Education for the Handicapped Child," reflects our discussions and deliberations at these meetings.

In submitting it to you we hope that the Report will be of use to you, the Secretary, and the Congress, and that it will prove useful also to teachers, the parents of handicapped children, and all others devoted to strengthening educational opportunities for the Nation's eight million handicapped youngsters.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Wrobel, Chairperson
National Advisory Committee
on the Handicapped

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE HANDICAPPED
400 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

April 11, 1977

The Honorable Walter F. Mondale
President of the Senate
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. President:

The individualized education program concept called for in the Public Law 94-142 amendments to the Education of the Handicapped Act promises to bring far-reaching changes in the conduct of education in the United States, and in particular to greatly strengthen the education of children with handicaps.

It was this prospect that led the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped to make the individualized program the subject of its 1977 Annual Report. In submitting that report the Committee would like to express its gratitude for the noteworthy programs for the handicapped enacted by the Congress during the past decade, climaxed by the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975.

We would hope that our report, entitled "The Individualized Education Program--Key to an Appropriate Education for the Handicapped Child," will be of interest and use to Members of the Congress and to all others concerned with affording handicapped children their full rights as citizens, the right to a good education included.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Wrobel

Charles F. Wrobel, Chairperson
National Advisory Committee
on the Handicapped

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE HANDICAPPED
400 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

April 11, 1977

The Honorable Thomas P. O'Neill
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Speaker:

The individualized education program concept called for in the Public Law 94-142 amendments to the Education of the Handicapped Act promises to bring far-reaching changes in the conduct of education in the United States, and in particular to greatly strengthen the education of children with handicaps.

It was this prospect that led the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped to make the individualized program the subject of its 1977 Annual Report. In submitting that report the Committee would like to express its gratitude for the noteworthy programs for the handicapped enacted by the Congress during the past decade, climaxed by the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975.

We would hope that our report, entitled "The Individualized Education Program--Key to an Appropriate Education for the Handicapped Child," will be of interest and use to Members of the Congress and to all others concerned with affording handicapped children their full rights as citizens, the right to a good education included.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Wrobel, Chairperson
National Advisory Committee
on the Handicapped

v

The National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped

Under its charter, the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped is responsible for reviewing "the administration and operation of programs authorized by the Education of the Handicapped Act and other provisions of law administered by the Commissioner with respect to the handicapped, including their effect in improving the educational attainment of handicapped children."

Thus by implication the Committee is the public's representative, both in monitoring the performance of existing Federal programs relating to education of the handicapped, and in advocating what it perceives to be needed changes.

As part of its review function the Committee also is called upon to make an annual report of its activities, findings, and recommendations to the Commissioner—for his transmission to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and to the Congress—and to submit such additional reports as it may deem appropriate. The Committee's charter, issued by the Secretary in October 1973 following the amalgamation of two predecessor committees (the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children and the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf), also includes responsibility for reviewing the administration and operation of the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

The Committee consists of 15 members, including a chairperson, appointed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. Selected from throughout the Nation, these members include persons active in education, training, research, technological, and community programs for the handicapped, and at least three handicapped persons.

The Committee was established under Section 448(b) of the General Education Provisions Act and derives authority from Section 604(a) of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Committee operations are governed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act and by Part D of the General Education Provisions Act.

It has been the Committee's practice to meet four times annually, with these meetings being devoted in part to discussions with persons active in special education matters, either as practitioners or "consumers." Announcements of the time, place, and subject matter of these sessions are published in the Federal Register well in advance of meeting dates.

All meetings during the Committee's 1976–77 term were held in Washington, D.C.—August 4–6 and October 20–22, 1976, and January 17–19 and June 8–10, 1977.

MEMBERSHIP
NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE HANDICAPPED

(As of December 31, 1976)

Evelyn D. Baggs
Director of Education
National Children's Rehabilitation Center
Leesburg, Virginia — *6/30/77

James N. Blake
Associate Professor of Audiology and Speech Pathology
School of Education
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky — *6/30/78

Mrs. Wendell G. Froeland
5631 Woodmont Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania — *6/30/78

Diego Gallegos
Research Coordinator
Tulare County Education Department
Visalia, California — *6/30/79

Jean S. Garvin
Director
Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services
State Department of Education
Montpelier, Vermont — *6/30/77

Harold W. Heller
Superintendent
Bryce Hospital
Tuscaloosa, Alabama — *6/30/78

Barbara K. Keogh
Director of Special Education Research Program
University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California — *6/30/77

Suzanne F. Lile
3821 92nd Avenue, N.E.
Bellevue, Washington — *6/30/79

William J. A. Marshall
Director
Model Secondary School for the Deaf
Gallaudet College
Washington, D.C. — *6/30/79

June B. Miller
Chairperson
Hearing and Speech Department
University of Kansas Medical Center
Kansas City, Kansas — *6/30/79

Max C. Rheinberger, Jr.
President
Offices Services Incorporated
Duluth, Minnesota — *6/30/77

Reese Robrahn
Director of Research and Governmental Affairs
American Council for the Blind
Washington, D.C. — *6/30/79

Janet A. Weasel
Director, Field Service Unit
College of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan — *6/30/78

Charles F. Wrobel **
Manager, Special Needs
Special Intermediate School District #916
White Bear Lake, Minnesota — *6/30/77

Joel D. Ziev
Coordinator, Special Education
Hartford Public Schools
Hartford, Connecticut — *6/30/78

---

* Date appointment terminates
** Chairperson

Leroy V. Goodman
Executive Secretary

Contents

Letters of Transmittal	iii
The National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped	vii
Committee Membership as of December 31, 1976	ix
Introduction	1
Recommendations	3
Implementing the IEP Concept	6
The IEP and Personnel Preparation	10
The IEP and Physical Education, Recreation, and Leisure	15
The IEP as Seen at Two Special Institutions	19
The Intent of Congress	23
Status of the Committee's 1976 Recommendations	35

Introduction

Not only in enhancing education for the handicapped but in strengthening education generally, Public Law 94–142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, calls for numerous important advances.

Among them is a requirement that the education of each handicapped child shall be conducted in accordance with an "individualized education program"—an IEP, as it will be referred to in this report. As set forth in several references in the Act, Congress clearly intended the IEP to be the key to attaining the Act's goal of assuring "a free appropriate public education" to every handicapped child.

Although the concept of individualized programs or learning plans is not a recent innovation, progressive teachers having used versions of such an approach virtually since the beginning of pedagogy, its formal application on a day-to-day basis will present the vast majority of the Nation's school staffs with a new experience. For most teachers that experience will be a gratifying one, for the IEP can be an invaluable scholastic tool. Some, to be sure, may find the prospect of IEPs disturbing, since the individualized plan establishes a basis for measuring not only the performance of the student but by implication that of the staff responsible for the student's instruction.

Given the potential scope of its overall impact—not only on the Nation's eight million handicapped children and their parents, but on virtually every public school teacher and administrator, and directly or indirectly on all public school students—the IEP approach seems destined to be the subject of intense national discussion and perhaps controversy during the next several years.

In the hope of making a contribution to that discussion, the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped devoted its 1976–77 term to examining the IEP from several points of view, supplementing the expertise and experience represented in the Committee's membership by inviting authoritative individuals in the field to join the Committee in its deliberations.

These sessions formed the basis for this 1977 Annual Report, which leads off with a recapitulation of the National Advisory Committee's recommendations as extracted from the sections presented on the succeeding pages.

The first full section of the report proper consists of a summary of the Committee's views and findings concerning the day-to-day implementation of the IEP concept. Contributing to some of the discussions of this matter were the parent of a handicapped child, a teacher in an intermediate school district, and a BEH program officer involved in drawing up the Federal regulations concerning the IEP provisions of P.L. 94–142.

The second section is devoted to a consideration of the IEP in terms of teacher preparation. Participating in the Committee deliberations on which this section is based were a teacher trainer on a university staff, a coordinator of special education programs at the county level, the two top special education officials of a State department of education, and the director of the BEH Division of Personnel Preparation.

The third section focuses on three intertwined aspects of handicapped children's education that often have been slighted in the past and that need to be given much more than lip service in the preparation of IEPs—physical education, recreation, and leisure time education. In the discussions concerning these matters the Committee was joined by authorities representing each of these three fields, along with a BEH physical education and recreation specialist.

The fourth section is a consideration of the IEP as it relates to the National Technical Institute for the Deaf and the Model Secondary School for the Deaf, the Committee having a charter responsibility to review the operations of these two institutions. Representatives of NTID and MSSD met with the Committee for this discussion.

Basic background that school people and others may want to have available in the implementation

of the IEP is the intent of Congress. Thus the fifth section of the report is a compilation, assembled from the *Congressional Record*, of the statements made about the IEP during the Senate and House debates concerning P.L. 94–142.

The report concludes with an account, based on a presentation by Dr. Edwin Martin, Jr., Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, of what has occured in connection with the Committee's 1976 recommendations.

1. As the National Advisory Committee seeks to underscore in the following pages, achieving the potential of the individualized education program concept called for in Public Law 94–142 will require a massive in-service personnel preparation effort.

As the entities responsible for the conduct of education in the United States, the State and local school agencies must bear most of the costs of this effort. However, since the training effort will necessarily involve some 250,000 special education teachers and many if not all of the 2,000,000 "regular" teachers—plus support personnel ranging from psychologists to aides—additional resources will be necessary, particularly during the initial years of the IEP's implementation.

To some extent the State and local education agencies will have recourse to Federal funds allocated under the State Grant program established by Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA). However, the cost of meeting the law's mandate of providing services to every handicapped child is likely to leave little money for other purposes.

What might seem a more likely source of Federal support is the Training program established by Part D of EHA. Here too, however, other important demands also are being made on this program. There is the crucial need, for example, to train special education teachers for the severely handicapped, for handicapped children heretofore excluded from education altogether, and for pre-school handicapped children. Thus while the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped is now devoting about a fourth of the total amount available under this program to in-service training, no increase seems possible without reducing the amounts being reserved for higher priorities established in the law.

Moreover, the Fiscal Year 1977 appropriation of $45 million for Part D is about the same as it was for Fiscal Year 1976 and as it was scheduled to remain for Fiscal Year 1978. Taking inflation into account, the amount of Part D money available has in effect been shrinking. Given the imperative need to assure that all school personnel who will be involved in the education of handicapped children are prepared to launch the individualized program provisions of P.L. 94–142, the National Advisory Committee makes the following recommendation:

That the Congress substantially increase the appropriation for Part D of the Education of the Handicapped Act.

2. Also in connection with personnel preparation, the Committee reviewed a General Accounting Office report (B–164031(1)) issued by the Comptroller General of the United States in September 1976 and entitled "Training Educators for the Handicapped: A Need to Redirect Federal Programs." The Committee took particular note of the report's recommendation that the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped concentrate its personnel preparation funds on in-service training for "regular" teachers, at the expense of preservice training for additional special educators, and reached the following conclusions:

First, the recommendations set forth in the report are focused on a traditional handicapped child population served by traditional educational programs. Second, the report is based on data collected between 1972 and 1975, and thus the information base is outdated and inaccurate. Third, the report's conclusions do not take into account the impact of Public Law 94–142, nor do they recognize the training needs implicit in that law.

In mandating a free and appropriate education for all handicapped children, P.L. 94–142 gives the public schools responsibility for thousands of pupils previously excluded. For many handicapped children, placement in a "regular" education program may be optimal. However, many of the previously unserved or inadequately served pupils will require the continuing services of special education professionals, in the preparation

of individualized education programs and in numerous other ways. The primary source of these trained teachers and administrators is the pre-service training program. Thus there is need for expanded rather than decreased Federal support for the training of special educators at the pre-service level.

An additional training need, recognized in the report, has to do with the training of regular education personnel to work with handicapped pupils in the "mainstream" classroom. The Committee vigorously supports the GAO position in this regard. However, the preparation of professionals to serve handicapped pupils is not an "either-or" matter. Successful implementation of P.L. 94–142 requires support for both in-service and pre-service training, since in varying degrees the education of handicapped pupils will be the responsibility of both special and regular educators. To argue for expansion of one aspect of training at the cost of the other is short sighted at best.

The National Advisory Committee urges reconsideration and reformulation of the GAO's proposals so as to take into account both current and future training needs, and makes the following recommendation:

That BEH support for personnel preparation be afforded in such a way as to stimulate close coordination between educational service agencies and institutions of higher education, with this coordination applying to pre-service and in-service training programs alike.

3. The preparation of individualized education programs envisages a cooperative effort involving the child's parents, the child whenever possible, and appropriate members of the school staff. Many parents say, however, that they are uncertain of how to perform their role in this arrangement. Others say they have difficulty dealing with school staffs on an equal basis. Also, the suggestion was advanced by several people heard by the Committee that the IEP writing process would be strengthened if arrangements were made to involve a kind of ombudsman—a person to serve as advocate and if necessary mediator. In view of these comments, and toward helping assure that the individual child's interests are properly served, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

That the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped provide models and demonstrations designed to foster and improve the quality of parent participation in the preparation of individualized education programs; and that BEH make a special effort both to alert school administrators and special educators to the surrogate parent provisions of P.L. 94–142, and to encourage school districts to provide advocates for children or parents who request such assistance.

4. Although application of the individualized education program represents a significant step forward in the education of handicapped children, it also poses many extra challenges to school staffs. Few teachers have received any training in the planning and implementation of IEPs, and few schools have ready access to sources of expertise in these areas.

However, the IEP concept not only has been the subject of considerable study but has been put to practice with handicapped children in some locations. It would seem apparent that teachers and school staffs could greatly benefit from sharing in the knowledge that has thus been gained. The Committee would therefore make the following recommendation:

That the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped provide for ways by which model individualized education programs, and the rationale behind their contents and emphases, be made available to all interested school districts and teacher training institutions.

5. It has become common practice to think of physical education, recreation, and leisure time activities as being unimportant and even frivolous aspects of the child's scholastic experience. The National Advisory Committee would disagree, particularly as regards handicapped children, for whom training in these fields can be vital.

Physical fitness has a special importance to persons with disabilities, and yet for many it is more difficult to maintain than is the case with the nonhandicapped. Moreover, handicapped persons are no less interested than the nonhandicapped in developing physical skills, playing games, competing in athletics, and enjoying the satisfaction of being part of a team effort. Recreational

and leisure time activities—taking part in plays, being in the school band, learning arts and crafts, visiting museums, belonging to activity groups—also have a special importance for the handicapped, helping them to reach out to other people and become active, participating members of the community.

Public Law 94–142 has recognized the importance of physical education, recreation, and leisure education in the lives of handicapped children, and the P.L. 94–142 regulations require that IEPs include appropriate services in these areas to meet their special needs. However, given the neglect that has so often occurred, the National Advisory Committee makes the following recommendation:

That the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped monitor school performance in physical education and recreation for the handicapped during the next five years; that during this period it issue brief annual reports indicating the degree to which physical education and recreation are reflected in individualized education programs; and that it continue to encourage the dissemination of related instructional programs, materials, and models.

Implementing the IEP Concept

In its call for an "individualized education program" (IEP) for each handicapped child, P.L. 94–142 can be credited with having codified what has long been recognized as superior teaching practice. In doing so it may very well speed the use of the approach for all children. In any case, the IEP is for several reasons of particular importance in the education of children with handicaps. Not the least of these reasons is the fact that it provides a natural point of departure from the conventional tendency to see handicapped children primarily in terms of their disabilities rather than as individuals—of viewing them as homogeneous, failing to recognize the wide variations that they, no less than nonhandicapped children, display. Another is lowered expectations, of demanding (and thereby usually getting) far less of the handicapped child than of his or her "normal" peer. These matters are of specific relevance to the preparation of individualized programs, since the attitudes reflected in IEPs cannot help but be of key importance in determining the substance and reality of the activities they call for.

No matter how carefully it may be defined, the term "individualized education program" can be expected to mean different things to different people, depending on the nature of their involvement in it. One particular point of view is represented by those who are in various ways directly concerned with putting the IEP into practice.

Toward exploring the IEP from that approach the Committee asked three representative kinds of "implementers" to join in its deliberations: the mother of a handicapped child—Mrs. Carol Smith of Ballston Lake, New York; an educator at the local level—Robert Gibson, Director of Special Education for the Hartland Area Education Agency in Ankenny, Iowa; and a member of the BEH staff involved in drafting regulations concerning the IEP, Jerry Vlasak of the Aid to States Branch.

Enforcing a view of handicapped children as individuals rather than as faceless members of a category is but one of a number of potential advantages of the IEP. It provides accountability for achieving specific goals in specified periods of time. It serves as a quality control mechanism, requiring the discipline of developing plans that are well-reasoned and well-considered. By calling for the involvement of parents, it fosters closer communication and greater trust between the school and the community. It replaces random instructional activities, based on standardized goals, with particularized activities calculated to achieve goals important to the particular student. By virtue of the requirement that it be a written document that can readily be referred to, it promotes term-to-term continuity and consistency. It can accommodate varying grouping patterns (e.g., one-to-one tutoring, small groups, large groups, hospital or homebound instruction, and special resource activities). By introducing an interdisciplinary, team approach—rather than depending on the vagaries of one individual's decisions—it can be productive of more balanced and comprehensive planning. And such an interdisciplinary approach results in an atmosphere far more supportive of the classroom teacher.

As with other innovations, the IEP concept also presents potential problems, not because of weaknesses inherent in the technique itself but because its application entails the acceptance of some new viewpoints. In some schools it may represent a considerable break with customary practices. Not simply the IEP but P.L. 94–142 in general calls for ending the pervasive feeling in school circles that handicapped children and the teachers who serve them are not really a part of the "regular" school system but have separate needs and interests. To the extent that this feeling persists, it will constitute a significant barrier to progress. Another potential problem is the possibility that some individual staff members may contend that they do not have time to get involved in preparing IEPs, or there may be

those who prepare them only on a casual, pro forma basis and thereafter pay them no attention.

For the most part, however, the IEP will essentially mean the formalization and perhaps elaboration of what the teachers in many if not most school systems have long accepted as good practice. To a not insignificant extent, of course, the IEP approach may very well entail some rather extensive administrative adjustments, including several that some school officials may not have taken into account. The fact is that preparing IEPs *will* command special amounts of time, not only for the handicapped child's teacher but for other members of the staff who should be included on the planning team, and perhaps for outside professionals whose counsel may be crucially important.

Moreover, the teacher will not only be deeply engaged in developing the content of the IEP but in most cases will probably have to take the lead in carrying out the school's obligation to set up IEP conferences, arrange for the time and place, make sure that the parents and appropriate members of the staff will be there, and in general handle what may in some cases prove to be fairly complex logistical situations. Further, staff allocations are going to have to be made in such a way as not only to accommodate planning conferences and other necessary activities, but to make sure that the children's schooling does not grind to an abrupt halt because the staff is buried in writing IEPs.

In short, for those portions of the school year that henceforth must include allowance for writing and revising IEPs, the classroom teacher is going to need special backup support—clerical and secretarial as well as professional—plus access to special services, facilities, and materials. Further, time will have to be set aside for training teachers and other members of the staff in the IEP's preparation and implementation. While the essence of the individualized program is its content rather than the mechanics of how it is designed and prepared, not just *some* teachers but even the most experienced will need appropriate in-service training and if possible access to model programs.

As for who should be involved in drawing up the IEP, the proposed regulations can be read as requiring only the bare minimum of the child's teacher and another member of the staff qualified as a teacher or supervisor in special education. The child's parents or guardian also are to be present if possible (and in fact the school must otherwise produce persuasive, documented evidence that a substantial effort was made to get a parent to take part), and the student if appropriate. BEH officials responsible for drafting these regulations have sought to make it clear that in practice they would see the presence of a parent as fundamental and the participation of other staff members who deal closely with the child as at least highly desirable and in professional terms requisite.

However, they said, BEH has made every effort not to over-regulate but instead to keep Federal requirements to a minimum, particularly until there has been time to gain experience with the new provisions. By the letter of the law, then, the IEP could theoretically be the product of just two members of the school staff—the child's teacher and one other academically qualified person—provided that the parents steadfastly declined or refused to participate and that the child clearly was unable to contribute. By the spirit of the law, however, not to speak of appropriate professional practice, the IEP's preparation will definitely involve not only one or both parents and probably the child, but other teachers and staff—special and "regular" alike—directly involved in the child's school experience. Only then is the IEP likely to meet the expectations of Congress and to be of optimum scope, content, and effectiveness. Moreover, the process would be strengthened if arrangements were made to involve a kind of ombudsman, a person to serve as advocate and if necessary as mediator, on behalf of the child and of the child's parents.

As in the case of who shall be involved in writing programs, that part of the proposed regulations dealing with the IEP's content seeks only to set forth the minimum. To some degree, however, the regulations do go beyond the law's barebones listing in order to clarify what was intended even if not explicitly stated. Thus the regulations echo the language of P.L. 94–142 in requiring that all IEPs include statements of the child's present levels of educational performance, annual goals, short-term instructional objectives, the extent to which the child will participate in regular programs, the dates during which the

IEP will be applicable, and the criteria and procedures that will be used in evaluating the program's effectiveness.

However, whereas the law calls for a statement of the services the school will seek to provide to the child, the proposed regulations ask for a statement of the specific services the child needs, irrespective of whether those services are actually available—thereby providing parents and administrators with a checkpoint for determining what the school must do to provide handicapped children with the kind of education foreseen in the law. Similarly, while the regulations closely follow the language of the law in asking for a description of the extent to which the child will participate in regular education programs, the proposed regulations go a step further and ask for "a justification for the type of educational environment which the child will have." Also, the proposed regulations ask for "a list of the individuals who are responsible for implementation of the individualized program," thereby signalling an expectation that the school's representation in preparing IEPs will consist not just of the child's teacher and one other member of the staff, but that the process will be a team approach involving all school personnel who could make a useful contribution.

The National Advisory Committee would in general approve the list of required IEP contents as set forth in the regulations, and judges from the comments of people from whom it invited testimony that this feeling is widespread. In practice the various elements of the list would presumably be fleshed out and expanded upon by the teachers and other members of local school staffs. The possibilities of such expansion are indicated by what the mother of a handicapped child said she would like to see in an IEP. She proposed that it include the following: "(1) A statement of my child's present development level in all areas relating to physical, emotional, and intellectual development; (2) a statement of my child's learning strengths; (3) a statement of any medical, environmental, or cultural consideration particular to my child; (4) a statement of my child's education needs and their relationship to the total sequence of developmental skills; (5) a statement of specific goals and timetables; (6) a statement of instructional alternatives; (7) a listing of appropriate educational materials relevant to my child's learning characteristics; (8) a clear delineation of the responsibilities of the entire planning team; (9) established time frames for daily programming, periodic review, and evaluation; and (10) a description of program procedures."

Looking at the IEP from the point of view of the teaching staff of a district that is already employing the IEP approach (Ankenny, Iowa), the basic educational component of an individualized program is seen in terms of "Sequence Skills Development," with the sequence consisting of specific objectives involving activities that can readily be changed (daily if need be) in accordance with a system of continuing evaluation of how well or poorly the objectives are being achieved. The model can be described, the staff says, as being a cyclic process characterised by "pre- and post-testing, observations, evaluation, and establishment of new objectives." They note that the program review component reaches beyond the progress of the child to analyze the effectiveness of methods and materials, activities, objectives, and the chosen criteria, with the ultimate purpose of the program being "the child's absorption into regular educational channels or vocational endeavors."

Whatever the format of the IEP, there seems to be little question that the strength and viability of the approach will depend in large measure on the breadth and quality of information gathered prior to writing it, and that this information should among other things reflect the contributions of an interdisciplinary team competent to measure the child's physical, emotional, and intellectual status and needs.

Equally important, of course, it should reflect the observations and opinions of the parent. That point was made time and again in the Senate and House debates concerning the bill, and was one of the reasons for a provision in the Senate version which would have required that IEP planning conferences for each child be held three times a year. This requirement was ultimately dropped in favor of "at least annually," chiefly on grounds that the frequency of conferences should not be rigidly fixed in Federal law but rather should be determined by the individual IEP planning group in accordance with the individual student's needs.

In agreeing to this compromise, however, many of the IEP's proponents emphasized that

the law obviously did not preclude more frequent meetings and that in fact additional sessions would serve such valuable purposes that a once-yearly schedule would probably be the rare exception. Beyond the benefits of infusing the parent's insights and observations into the discussion, it was pointed out, their frequent involvement would function as an extension of the procedural protections now being guaranteed to the parents of handicapped children, offering them not only an opportunity to check on their children's progress but putting them in a position to monitor such possible problems as labeling and misclassification.

Equally important, frequent conferences were seen as enabling the parents to get a better understanding of their children's needs and problems, to receive professional counseling, and to learn how to bolster the child's school experiences by providing supplementary educational experiences in the home.

So, although the law and the regulations prescribe only that IEP conferences shall be held "at least annually," a more frequent schedule clearly was envisaged by the law's designers, on grounds that additional meetings would produce important additional results.

Nonetheless, the National Advisory Committee would commend BEH for avoiding any temptation to over-regulate in this or any other aspect of the individualized education program. Good sense suggests minimum intervention until the IEP and other provisions of P.L. 94–142 have been tested in the schools. The Committee feels a similar restraint about recommending any changes in these regulations as they now stand, or in the law itself.

At the same time the Committee is aware that individualized education programs have been the subject of considerable study during recent years; and that under this designation or some other, the basic concept is already being used with handicapped children in 23 States. It would seem clear that teachers and school officials elsewhere would benefit from the knowledge and experience that has thus been gained. The Committee would therefore recommend that the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped consider possible ways of making model IEPs (and the thinking and experimentation and testing behind them) readily available to interested school districts and teacher training institutions. In advancing that suggestion the Committee would also note its support of the following propositions:

1. That the individualized education program is an invaluable education tool which should be fully and unreservedly used by every school in the Nation, with every handicapped child;

2. That the IEP should be seen as concerning the whole child, in all aspects of his or her life—outside of school as well as in it, and bearing on physical and emotional as well as intellectual needs;

3. That the preparation of each IEP should be an interdisciplinary effort, with appropriate participation by every member of the staff who can make a substantial contribution;

4. That every effort should be made to involve parents both in the development of IEPs and in their implementation; and

5. That school officials should demonstrate their understanding of the importance of IEPs by establishing priorities, special in-service training programs, teacher schedules, and resource allocation procedures that recognize the needs involved and assure optimum results.

The IEP and Personnel Preparation

The requirement in the Public Law 94–142 amendments to the Education of the Handicapped Act that the schooling of each handicapped child must be based on an individualized education program will be a major element in touching off what promises to be one of the most massive teacher training efforts the Nation has ever witnessed.

Most of that effort will of necessity focus on in-service programs for those already on the job—the estimated 260,000 special education personnel and the 2,000,000–plus "regular" classroom teachers. Though some of these teachers already are using the IEP concept, for most it represents a new pedagogical experience.

While the concept of tailoring children's schooling to their individual needs is not a new one, few teachers are prepared to give that concept practical application in the classroom. Carrying out the P.L. 94–142 provisions for individualized education programs thus implies special training for all school personnel who will be involved in the education of handicapped children—which in something more than theory means the staffs of virtually every public school in the Nation.

For its consideration of the IEP and personnel preparation the Committee devoted much of its sessions of October 20–22, 1976, to receiving written and oral testimony offered by Robert H. Audette, Associate Commissioner (and Director of Special Education), and Barbara Levine, Assistant Director, both of the Massachusetts Department of Education; Jasper Harvey, Director of the BEH Division of Personnel Preparation; Linda Jacobs, Director of Special Education Programs, Anne Arundel County Public Schools, Maryland; and Gale Lambright, Associate Professor of Special Education, University of South Alabama.

Regular teachers and administrators also will need preparation for embarking on what is destined to become a basic element of most individualized programs, the placement of handicapped children in classrooms with nonhandicapped students. The law says that such placement, often loosely referred to as "mainstreaming," shall occur "to the maximum extent possible," which is to say to the extent that the handicapped child can be expected to progress at least as rapidly as if assigned to an institutional or segregated setting. Despite what seems to be the common impression, the disabilities of most handicapped youngsters are relatively minor, and expectations are that a substantial portion of the approximately 8,000,000 handicapped children involved will be served most appropriately if they spend at least part of their school day in regular classrooms.

While the major part of the IEP training effort will therefore be in-service in character, adjustments also will be necessary in the pre-service curriculums of the Nation's teacher training institutions, in particular at the 516 colleges and universities that prepare students for careers in special education. Especially in the years immediately ahead—while the IEP concept is being further refined—these institutions will need to devote considerable energy to training prospective special educators not only in the philosophy, development, and implementation of an IEP but in communicating their knowledge and insights to other members of the school staff.

It can be anticipated that one result of the far-reaching training effort stimulated by P.L. 94–142 will be the forging of new partnerships between the Nation's 16,000 school districts and the colleges and universities that supply them with teachers. The likely prospect is that school districts and nearby institutions of higher learning will enter into formal alliances under which they mutually identify the skills and competencies needed in preparing and administering IEPs, the appropriate content of in-service programs, and the ground rules under which the institutions will contract to provide those programs.

Given the special skills and perceptions involved in working with the variety of handicapping conditions cited in the Education of the Handicapped Act,* it would self-evidently seem impossible that in-service training would be sufficient to equip regular teachers to succeed, on their own, with the range of situations they can be expected to encounter in "mainstreamed" classrooms. An appropriate training experience can, however, provide invaluable orientation to the challenges involved, enlightened sensitivity to each handicapped child's unique needs, the basics of prescribing for those needs, and the foundation on which to establish ready communications with the child's parents and with special educators and relevant support members of the school staff.

Deeper and more far-reaching additional "training" for classroom teachers can be expected to occur in the day-to-day interaction between regular teachers and the special education teachers assigned to work with them, particularly if they function in the classroom as equal partners. Perhaps the future will see several different kinds of instructional approaches in the education of handicapped children—including regular classroom teachers presiding over "mainstreamed" classes, special education teachers who conduct self-contained programs to which handicapped children might be referred for varying parts of the day, and liaison or resource teachers trained in special education who work with these teachers and also establish strong links with those members of the school staff who have contact with the handicapped students and should be involved in preparing and revising their IEPs. In any case, a broad-scale personnel preparation program clearly is essential if the IEP is to be a standard aspect of each handicapped child's schooling.

A training effort on the scale implicit in the P.L. 94–142 requirements regarding IEPs and "mainstreaming" will of course require a good deal of money. A degree of support can be expected from the BEH Division of Personnel Preparation through Part D of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Of the $45.3 million made available to BEH for Fiscal Year 1977 under this provision, 21.3 percent or about $9.6 million was reserved for the training of regular school personnel. For Fiscal Year 1978 the Division raised the percentage to 24.8 percent, which translates into an increase of some $1.5 million.

That boost represents, however, about the limit to which the Bureau can or should go under present circumstances. For one thing, the $45 million allocated for Fiscal Year 1977 is about the same amount allocated for FY 1976 and scheduled to be continued during Fiscal Year 1978. Given the steady erosion caused by inflation during that period, the buying power of training funds administered by the Bureau has significantly shrunk.

Moreover, important though the training of regular school personnel unquestionably is, other equally urgent priorities have to be considered. There must be a pool of trained special educators to work with the severely handicapped, for example, and with the pre-school handicapped children now covered by P.L. 94–142. The "child find" provisions of the Act mean that education will be extended to unknown numbers of heretofore hidden or excluded handicapped children, and there must be an adequate supply of special educators to work with them. Additionally, there will be an increasing need for special education personnel in such areas as physical education and career-vocational education, not to speak of such support personnel as psychologists, audiologists, occupational therapists, aides, and the like. In short, there will be an increasingly heavy demand on a steadily diminishing supply of funds. The Congress clearly could do much to alleviate the situation if it increased the level of Part D funds, and the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped strongly recommends that it do so. Meanwhile, however, no increase in the proportion of Part D allocations devoted to the training of regular school teachers seems warranted or possible.

It should be noted that a much different point of view has been expressed in a report issued by the Government Accounting Office and entitled "Training Educators for the Handicapped: A Need to Redirect Federal Programs." In essence this report asserts that the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped should cease or at least greatly reduce its support of training programs

* "The term 'handicapped children' means mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, or other health impaired children, or children with specific learning disabilities." (Sec. 602)

for special education personnel and instead concentrate available funds on the preparation of regular teachers to work with handicapped children. This assertion is based on two contentions: First, that most handicapped children spend all or most of their school day in regular classrooms under the supervision of regular teachers; and second, that about 10,000 of the 30,000 special educators now emerging from the teacher training institutions each year represent a surplus.

Both of these contentions seem at best dubious. The GAO assumption that most handicapped children are being educated in regular classrooms is nowhere substantiated in the report itself, and everyday observation, supported by such evidence as the rash of suits filed in recent years on behalf of handicapped children denied a public education, would suggest that it is inaccurate. As for the second contention, that the number of special educators being turned out by the schools and colleges exceeds the demand, BEH projections based on plans submitted by the States in accordance with the EHA Part B State Grant program tell a different story. Officials of the Bureau's Aid to States branch calculated that carrying out the P.L. 94–142 mandate to provide full services to all handicapped children would require approximately 46,500 new teachers for the 1976–77 year alone, leaving a deficit of 16,500. Moreover, that projection did not take into account the thousands of teachers who will be needed to staff the pre-school programs called for in the law.

The fact nevertheless remains, as the GAO report indicates, that the training of regular classroom teachers to work with handicapped children, and to be able to devise appropriate IEPs for them, is a major challenge. Obviously, the goal should be to assure that all teachers, administrators, and support personnel have received the kind of training required for working effectively with handicapped children. The GAO's essential error lies in its misreading of the numbers of special education teachers that also will be needed if such P.L. 94–142 priorities as pre-school programs and improving the education of severely handicapped youngsters are to be satisfied, together with its failure to take into account the merit of the competing demands on Part D funds for these and other important purposes.

Under those circumstances, a more promising source of Federal funds for in-service training would seem to be the EHA Part B State Grant program. Indeed, P.L. 94–142 specifically amended the language of Part B to include the mandate that the States undertake to organize and carry out "a comprehensive system of personnel development which shall include the in-service training of general and special educational instructional and support personnel . . ." *

Last year, according to the BEH Assistance to States Division, Part B funds were used to provide in-service training to some 175,000 teachers. Given the major increases in annual appropriations called for under P.L. 94–142, together with the law's requirement that each handicapped child's education be based on an IEP and conducted in the least restrictive environment commensurate with the child's needs, it would seem clear that a significant portion of State grant funds from the Federal Government will have to be used to supplement State and local funds in order to give appropriate training to the Nation's regular teachers and administrators. The immediate needs of the children involved must of course come first, and particularly the needs of severely handicapped children and children not heretofore served. Whether the fulfillment of these and other obligations under the law will leave sufficient funds to enable the States to mount adequate training programs is not clear. The launching of a broad scale in-service training program is in any case essential, and its design should include—as the proposed P.L. 94–142 regulations suggest—such incentives to participation as released time, options for academic credit, salary step credit, and the like.

This heavy stress on the need for training should not be taken to imply that regular teachers are going to feel hopelessly adrift in unchartered waters when handicapped children are assigned to their classrooms, or that writing IEPs may prove to be beyond their powers. To be sure, diagnosing and prescribing for the needs of children with the various kinds of handicapping conditions can be a complex matter, and regular teachers will need to be oriented to the issues, possibilities, and restraints involved, and to be

* As elaborated on in P.L. 94–142 regulations, the personnel involved include "therapeutic recreation personnel, occupational therapists, itinerant resource personnel, physical therapists, diagnosticians, psychologists, counselors, and aides."

further supported by having ready access to special education professionals.

Nonetheless, handicapped children are far more like their nonhandicapped peers than they are unlike them, and the preparation of an IEP will in general involve the same basic competencies displayed by effective classroom teachers every day: Organizing a program of study and arranging for the necessary people and equipment and materials to carry it out; collecting and analyzing relevant data; assessing the student's abilities and needs; establishing achievable objectives; gauging and guiding the child's interactions with others; determining the most effective environment for the child's schooling; evaluating and when necessary modifying the program; and facilitating the child's progression to more demanding experiences.

As the instrument for applying these competencies, the IEP emerges as a highly useful management tool. It is not a program guide setting forth day-to-day instructional strategies, nor a lesson plan suitable for children of a particular age. Rather, it is a means of establishing a systematic approach for planning the education of individual handicapped children, for allocating the appropriate resources, and for developing true accountability.

Traditionally the principal barrier to such systemization has been the character of the information on which most decision-making has had to be based. Teachers have had little choice but to rely on the results of testing procedures that aside from commonly being subjective and culturally biased, measure achievement not so much on the basis of substance as on pitting student against student. The IEP approach carries with it the possibility of a far more useful alternative. Information gathered during the course of preparing and revising children's programs—and including not only the results of various formal and informal diagnoses but expert input from a range of specialists—can provide a data base for an information system specifically useful both for planning optimal learning experiences for individual children and for effectively allocating resources on a district-wide basis.

As implemented by an appropriately trained teacher, the IEP approach assumes that differences among children are normal, that school is not a contest, and that the effectiveness of the teaching-learning process is to be measured in terms of the individual student's progress toward prestated goals. The basic concern is not with how well students fare in comparison with their classmates, but with the effectiveness of particular instructional methods, strategies, environments, locations, and materials. The essence of the individualized approach is that the schools undertake to adjust to their students rather than expecting the students to adjust to the schools. It implies accommodation to each child's learning style, with the student proceeding at his or her own pace, using materials that emphasize his or her particular strengths. The IEP thus calls for new attitudes and perceptions on the part of school personnel, along with new competencies, and the inculcation of these new attitudes and perceptions must be no less a part of personnel preparation programs that the imbuement of skills in such areas as writing instructional objectives or matching instructional strategies with the individual student's learning style.

In short, both in spirit and in practical application, the IEP is the quintessential expression of P.L. 94–142's fundamental purpose. The National Advisory Committee thus firmly endorses a provision in the proposed P.L. 94–142 regulations requiring that State plans submitted under the Education of the Handicapped Act include a detailed description of procedures that local school districts will follow to assure that appropriate training has been provided to all school personnel whose students are to include children with handicaps.

As for what might be taught concerning the individualized program's content, it is worth noting that the departments of education in six States say they have mandated a standardized form or outline, to be followed by all schools in all districts. Such an approach assures that all schools are going in more or less the same direction, it is claimed, and that all IEPs at least meet minimum requirements. Critics argue, however, that the imposition of a standard form is at odds with the essential spirit of the IEP and in any event constitutes an unwarranted restriction on local districts. Proponents say the standard form also provides other benefits, among them that it facilitates the collection of data necessary to assure adherence to due process procedures, that it enhances the State's ability to carry out the

monitoring functions called for in P.L. 94–142, and that it expedites the completion of reports that must be submitted to the Office of Education. To which opponents respond that these functions could as effectively be performed in other ways and that the standardized form exacts a higher price in rigidity than its alleged benefits are worth.

Obviously, the IEP provides considerable room for debate. There is much to learn about its application, and the teacher training experience will need to include exposure to a wide variety of approaches and models. In any event, such training must be given appropriate priority as a fundamental aspect of P.L. 94–142's implementation. Nothing could be more essential than that all school personnel—not only regular and special education teachers but administrators and support personnel as well—receive the kind of preparation needed to assure that the concept of the individualized education program achieves its full potential.

The IEP and Physical Education, Recreation, and Leisure

Estimates are that only about a fifth of the Nation's public schools offer physical education programs to handicapped children, and the availability of physical education professionals trained to work with such youngsters is reported to range from none in hundreds of school districts to about a fourth of the overall physical education staff in a few.

The result is that a vast majority of the eight million handicapped children in the United States do not receive appropriate physical education and recreation services. A similar situation exists in regard to the availability of recreation and of leisure time services for the Nation's approximately 27 million handicapped adults.

Developing motor skills and motor control, taking part in games and sports, learning to participate in recreation and leisure activities—these are important to the well-being of all persons. They are at least equally so for those with handicaps, not simply in terms of the individual's health but in building self-confidence and in opening doors for fuller participation in the larger society.

Handicapped children have historically received considerably less than a warm welcome from the public schools and they have fared little better as regards participation in physical education and recreational and leisure time activities. Recent years, however, have seen some States take the position that court decisions requiring equal educational opportunities for handicapped children extend to every aspect of schooling, such areas as physical education and the arts specifically included. That posture has now been given national imprimatur by Public Law 94–142 revisions of the Education of the Handicapped Act that call for the inclusion of physical education as a direct special education service and recreation as a related supportive service in every handicapped youngster's schooling.

The Federal interest in the situation is not new, going back a decade to the enactment of Public Law 90–170, the Mental Retardation Amendments of 1967. Under Title V of that law, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped established a Physical Education and Recreation Program that got under way in 1968 with an alloca-

---

In establishing through Public Law 94–142 a commitment to assure all handicapped children "a free appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs," the Congress clearly indicated that it was not talking just about book learning.

Section 602 of the new law declares that the term "special education" extends to instruction in physical education, and that the definition of "related services" encompasses recreation and leisure. It would thus seem self-evident that these and other non-academic areas need to be considered in drawing up individualized education programs.

Toward receiving facts and opinions regarding some of the issues that might be involved, a sampling of knowledgeable persons in the fields of physical education, recreation, and leisure education was invited to meet with the Committee at sessions held May 10–12, 1976, in Washington, D.C. Those attending included Donald E. Hawkins, Research Professor in Medicine, Human Kinetics, and Leisure Studies, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C.; William Hillman, Physical Education and Recreation Specialist, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Washington, D.C.; John A. Nesbitt, Professor and Chairman, Recreation Education Program, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; and Julian E. Stein, Consultant, Programs for the Handicapped, American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Washington, D.C.

Also present at the meeting were several other leading persons in these fields, and their comments were a valuable part of the discussion.

tion of $300,000 for the training of physical education and recreation personnel and another $300,000 for research and demonstration projects in these fields. Allocations gradually climbed thereafter and are reported by BEH to currently stand at $1.5 million for personnel training and $800,000 for R&D, with those two areas of activity having remained at the core of the program.

Since the program's inception some 1,150 students have received direct support for graduate-level work in either physical education or recreation, and another 275 are now in school. As a part of its basic goal of supporting professional development at the graduate level, the program seeks to build closer ties among practitioners of physical education, special educators, and "regular" education personnel; to assess current and projected needs for physical education specialists trained to work with the handicapped; and to stimulate the preparation of personnel to serve in areas of severe shortages.

The R&D phase of the program is currently supporting ten projects—four in physical education, four in recreation, and two in a relatively new but important area, creative arts. Many of these projects, particularly those continued from previous years, have produced a significant body of instructional programs and materials bearing on the implementation of P.L. 94–142 provisions calling for physical education as a direct special education service and recreation as a supportive related service.

One of the byproducts of the BEH Physical Education and Recreation Program has been wide acceptance of what is commonly referred to as "adapted" physical education. "Adapted" physical education can be said to encompass three different but complementary emphases. The first addresses the physical problems or needs of individual handicapped persons through remedial activities. The second calls for a program of various sports, games, and recreational pursuits modified so as to open them up to handicapped participants. The third is essentially a developmental motor skill and motor control program that optimally begins at the pre-school level and involves progressively more complex and more vigorous activities as the individual becomes ready for them.

Regarding the physical education and recreation components of an individualized education program, it should first of all be understood that there is no one activity or approach that can successfully be used for all handicapped persons or for all persons with a particular kind of handicapping condition. Rather, the most successful programs and materials are those that are designed on the basis of the individuality of the participants and their instructors or leaders, and that respond to their interests and abilities. Just as the IEP should be unique to the child involved, so should the physical education and recreation component of that IEP.

In planning such a component, it would be well to consider three general approaches. Youngsters who can take part in regular school and community activities safely, successfully, and with personal satisfaction should be encouraged to do so. Those who have problems involving confidence, physical conditions, skills, emotional stability, or the like might be offered an intermediate program that aims at ultimate participation in regular programs. And third, sheltered programs might be developed for severely and profoundly handicapped youngsters, the design being such as to involve increasingly rigorous activities in decreasingly sheltered situations.

In practice the activities ultimately decided upon may not be a great deal different from those undertaken by nonhandicapped persons. Note the following from a 1973 report of the Information and Research Utilization Center on Physical Education and Recreation for the Handicapped:

> *Visually impaired* ski cross country and downhill, participate in gymnastics, play golf, skin and scuba dive, wrestle, climb the highest mountains, and run in competitions such as the Boston marathon.
>
> *Amputees, paraplegics, and quadraplegics* ski, swim, fish, dive, surf, and take part in gymnastics, pool, archery, hockey, weight lifting, football, karate, basketball, golf, table tennis, track and field.
>
> *Bedfast individuals* take part in dramatic productions, work with clay, paint, attend parties.

Two points are particularly worth stressing in regard to the development of physical education programs for handicapped persons. The first is that the potential value of such programs is often

negated by the limited expectations of nonhandicapped persons involved in designing them. And second, experience has time and again shown the value of enabling handicapped persons to themselves determine what physical fitness goals they should achieve, what activities they want to pursue, and what if any adaptations and modifications they might want to make.

Particularly in the preparation of an IEP the student's ideas must of course be supplemented by the advice and counsel of a physical education professional who has been trained to work with handicapped youngsters. The supply of such professionals, however, is severely limited. Though the situation is slowly improving, reports indicate that currently only about a fourth of the States require any basic competence in adapted physical education for the certification of physical education teachers, with some others now moving in this direction. In any case, beyond the continuing need for specialists in developmental, adapted, and remedial physical education, it can be expected that there will be a growing demand for special resource personnel who can provide a link between classroom teachers and regular physical education teachers, particularly in the development of IEPs.

A related but nonetheless separate area meriting consideration in the development of IEPs is leisure time education. At the rate that the "leisure" concept is advancing in the United States—the "leisure industry" is said to already involve expenditures of well over $100 billion and to be still growing—perhaps the day will come when training in the use of time away from the job will be seen as a necessary part of the standard school curriculum. With children in special education the time for such training is now, for many are destined by the nature of their handicaps to devote a far greater portion of their adult lives to leisure than to working.

For such youngsters instruction in how to use free time in a satisfying, constructive manner can properly be thought of as a form of career education. Few people, adults included, automatically know how to derive as much stimulation and satisfaction from free time as they do from their jobs, as the difficulties faced by a large proportion of newly retired persons demonstrate. Especially for individuals whose disabilities have produced such side effects as social adjustment problems, learning how to find enjoyment and meaning during their leisure hours is no less important than learning how to read, speak, and count.

Perhaps the most effective setting for that kind of learning is the classroom. There handicapped children can receive systematic, long-term instruction and preparatory experiences that will give them the skills—and equally important, the confidence—to take part in the growing number of leisure activities being offered by various agencies and groups. Further, the continuing guidance and encouragement of a teacher can be crucial in encouraging such youngsters to venture into new experiences in new settings, and to refuse to be deterred.

Under the best of circumstances the handicapped individual will encounter serious obstacles, ranging from negative public attitudes to architectural barriers not only in such facilities as museums, theaters, bowling alleys, and sports arenas, but in schools and colleges. Nonetheless, thanks to what would appear to be a growing national determination to welcome handicapped people into the larger society, the physical barriers are being eliminated (as in such national shrines as the Lincoln and Jefferson memorials in Washington, D.C., for example, and in many institutions of higher education), and the participation of handicapped persons in park, playground, and community center programs, and in various special sporting events, is no longer uncommon.

The result is a direct challenge to the Nation's education system to devise and disseminate programs and materials for handicapped children and youth that will stimulate them to capitalize on the increasing opportunities that are becoming available. It is important that the schools do so, for the participation of the handicapped student in such activities is a fundamental part of being a "whole" person. These kinds of experiences provide balance to handicapped persons' lives, offering a means of surmounting limitations imposed by disabilities, and opening the way to joining with friends and neighbors as fully participating members of the community.

For such reasons as these, it seems clear that no IEP can be considered complete unless it takes into consideration the handicapped child's special need for training and guidance in physical education and recreation, and the constructive use of leisure time. Few classroom teachers are

equipped, however, even to evaluate such components, much less to help formulate them. The apparent alternative is to seek counsel from members of the school staff who have had professional training in these areas. In the great majority of schools, however, such persons are not available. Moreover, the shortage can be expected to become increasingly acute as more and more handicapped children move from segregated, sheltered settings into public school classrooms in accordance with the Public Law 94–142 "mainstreaming" provisions calling for the placement of handicapped children in the least restrictive environment commensurate with their needs. The importance of this expertise will be felt particularly in the case of children whose handicaps are such that their IEP should include developmental or remedial activities. The Nation's teacher training institutions clearly face a pressing challenge in this area. The National Advisory Committee hopes that at a minimum they will move to require that the curriculum for all physical education and recreation majors include basic competencies focused on teaching handicapped children, and suggests that leaders in the special education community join the Committee in urging appropriate officials of these institutions to consider such a requirement.

In any case, it is worth noting that the proposed P.L. 94–142 regulations do stipulate that all IEPs shall include a description of "the type of physical education program in which the child will participate." Whether that minimal reference will produce satisfactory results remains to be seen.

The National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped would therefore recommend that the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped pay particular attention to school performance in connection with this specific aspect of the IEP regulations during the next five years, and that brief annual reports be issued during this period indicating the degree to which appropriate physical education, recreation, and leisure time education activities are becoming a reality for the Nation's handicapped children.

The IEP as Seen at Two Special Institutions

One of the responsibilities assigned to the National Advisory Committee by its charter is to review the administration and operation of two special institutions—the National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID), located in New York State on the campus of the Rochester Institute of Technology; and the Model Secondary School for the Deaf (MSSD), located in Washington, D.C., on the campus of Gallaudet College.

As part of that function the Committee devoted a portion of its meeting of August 4–6, 1976, to an exploration of how the individualized education program is seen by those two institutions. Representing NTID at these sessions were Robert Frisina, Vice President, accompained by William E. Castle, Dean. Representing MSSD were Victor Galloway, Director of Developmental Education; accompanied by Michael Deninger, Assistant Principal.

National Technical Institute for the Deaf

The characteristics of the students served by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID) identify them clearly as being educationally disadvantaged because of their deafness and their overall levels of functioning. NTID has sought to serve these students through a systematic process of evaluating their needs, designing strategies to meet those needs, evaluating the implementation of those strategies, and conducting programmatic research.

The academic attainments of students entering NTID range from an overall eighth grade level (and often lower reading levels) to some who qualify for entry in one of the other colleges of Rochester Institute of Technology, the host institution, but who have educationally significant communication problems requiring special support services. NTID's deaf student body comes to the institute from throughout the United States and its territories. Their average hearing loss, across the speech range, is approximately 95 dB (a loss of 70 dB is recognized generally as a significant educational handicap).

Prior to coming to NTID, applicants submit information of the following types as the basis for beginning their educational plan: previous special educational requirements, audiologic data, achievement records, and personal and social maturity data.

Once accepted, each student continues in the process of data collection by attending a special summer program that offers orientation to programs, services, and career opportunities. Extensive testing is then conducted to complete the picture of skills and needs, including the Differential Aptitude Test (DAT), the Career Guidance and Placement Profile (CGPP), a math placement test, a Social Knowledge Component Test, and measurements of career maturity and the ability to make job-related decisions. Communications measurements are gathered on an English placement battery, the NTID vocabulary test, manual and simultaneous reception, speechreading with and without sound, speech diagnostic, speech intelligibility, and screening for vision problems. Other communications testing includes hearing thresholds for pure tones, phoneme identification, and hearing discrimination. Also, the academic departments test for prior knowledge and experience in such areas as physics, biology, and chemistry and for aptitude in computer programming.

These kinds of information are seen as providing the platform for evaluating a student's abilities in various career areas and the basis for planning specific experiences aimed at insuring success in those areas. The data are then collated and discussed with the student individually. The goal is to enable the student to become an integral part of developing his or her own individualized educational plan.

The process also involves sampling all career areas for which NTID provides training, and learning to identify career areas to which representative job titles belong. At the end of approximately four weeks, the students are expected to narrow their career areas for further sampling, and to learn to describe work environments rep-

resenting the areas they have selected. As intensive sampling progresses, students identify the specific skills required for the particular job areas they are sampling.

By the end of the summer experience, each student, with the assistance of a career development counselor, is expected to have developed a career development plan describing a set of courses and experiences for the next three quarters.

The student having matriculated, a number of techniques are employed to keep track of his or her progress under the agreed-upon career area chosen. These techniques include the following:

Individualized scheduling: Through a team approach, the progress of each student is reviewed quarterly. This process involves analysing the academic, communications, and personal-social aspects of the student's development and postulating future needs. Those projections are then compiled for allocation of resources—faculty, space, time—in such a manner that at least 95 percent of the students gain immediate matches of programs with plans. The remaining five percent have their needs met in alternative ways.

Learning centers: Because students have such disparate levels at entry and such a variety of learning needs and rates of learning, NTID has sought to develop a system of learning centers that allow for a variety of instruction to be provided at one time to meet several different students' needs concurrently. As part of that process, NTID is learning how to keep records on the progress of each student in the learning center so as to insure that diversity of program does not mean departure from the student's plan.

Communication records: The communication profiles of students—hearing, speech, manual language, speech-reading—change as they develop new skills. Through matching the ongoing communications profile with an automated data file, and applying statistical analyses of student trends and handicapping conditions, additional diagnostic tools for improving instruction are generated.

Turning to the advantages of the individualized educational program in the NTID experience, the institute's spokemen said one of the most significant is the resulting minimal rate of attrition. Fewer than 20 percent of NTID students fail to complete a program of study at NTID, they said, and of these, the majority are aided through further individualized programming to find educational placement elsewhere or job placement.

A second advantage was said to be a reduction of the impact of secondary handicaps that result from deafness. Together with the earliest possible detection of hearing loss, Dr. Frisina said, individualized programming increases the probability of reducing handicaps of speech, personal-social interaction, and language retardation.

A third advantage recognized at NTID has been a strong record in job placement. Ninety-seven percent of the graduates were reported to have been placed in jobs and 93 percent in jobs commensurate with their level of education and training.

While the advantages of the IEP seem clear and abundant, the existence of potential problems also must be recognized. The most significant of these, said NTID's spokemen, bear on attitudes. There is the sometimes-held attitude, for example, that the conventional existing system is in all cases appropriate and that all students must therefore accommodate to it, with individualized differences in students being dealt with through course grades or by exclusion from the program or school because of alleged inability to meet conventional requirements. The individualization of programs, Dr. Frisina said, requires a drastic change in attitudes by placing more responsibility for student success on the system and those in it.

Another major potential problem, he added, is vested interests. Conventional allegiance to a method, a system, or a teaching approach stands directly in opposition to the flexibility required to implement individualized programming, he said, and to advocate a single method is to deny that students differ from one another in their learning styles and their learning rates.

The resolution of these problems, should they arise, was seen by the NTID spokemen as being most readily achieved by treating the IEP as an inherent part of the education system rather than as an "add-on" to existing methods. There must

be a recognition that individualized programming is a clinical orientation, and that its success requires people with a clinical bent. And further, the techniques and tools of objective measurement must be acquired, used, and improved. Closing the circle of the individualization process is evaluation and modification of the treatment. Without objective measurement, evaluation appropriate to the needs of a student will be lacking.

Although individualized education plans are in use by many teachers and a few educational systems, Dr. Frisina said in summing up, such processes are not yet a significant part of the educational experiences of young people. Nevertheless, experience at NTID has demonstrated the concept to be helpful in improving the chances for deaf students moving toward economic parity. For example, the record of placement of the graduates of NTID in desired jobs is a reversal of the situation for deaf people who have not had the advantage of an NTID and for whom national data indicate under-employment to be prevalent.

Model Secondary School for the Deaf

In accordance with Public Law 89–694, an agreement between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Gallaudet College was signed on May 16, 1969, authorizing the establishment, construction, equipping, and operation of a Model Secondary School for the Deaf, to be located on the Gallaudet campus. MSSD's enrollment has by now risen to a total of 142 students, with 81 living on the campus. and 61 commuting.

Under P.L. 89–694, MSSD is mandated to provide a comprehensive high school education that is individualized for each student. Toward that end the goal is to develop a system of educational and career planning that imbues a sense of accountability and uses approaches that are individualized and student oriented.

The MSSD approach to the individualized education program was described as recognizing that there are differences among students and different rates of learning, and as seeking to pave the way for adaptation to those variances. In addition to providing students with a blueprint for success and a sense of direction, individualization is seen as insuring maximum use of educational resources.

Basic to the MSSD approach, the representatives of the school said, is the development of an educational plan that describes the current achievement level of the student and incorporates the level of educational achievement expected in accordance with MSSD requirements for graduation. The educational plan specifies required and elective courses the student must take each term and projects the student's summer plans, graduation date, and postsecondary goals—the concept being to insure that students receive every opportunity for meeting graduation requirements and for obtaining a comprehensive high school education that will meet their individual needs.

The first draft of the educational plan is developed jointly by the student and his or her advisor during the student's first term at MSSD. To the extent possible in a setting where most students are away from their homes, parents also participate. This draft is subject to the approval of parents and the principal's office and only then becomes operative, on a try-out basis. The student and advisor—and to the extent feasible, the parent—also review and revise this plan whenever circumstances may suggest, and in any case they consider it at least once annually.

At a minimum each educational plan includes a description of the student's current level of achievement; graduation requirements; courses to be taken, both required and elective; a term-by-term breakdown of these courses; plans for work-study and off-campus study; summer term plans; projected graduation date; and projected postsecondary goals.

The process of developing the plan usually begins with meetings of students and their advisors for an introduction to the individualized educational program concept. This orientation must be completed by the end of the first week of school, and included in it are the results of general interest surveys of the students, a discussion of the list of course offerings, and a final review of requirements for graduation.

By the end of the eighth week the students and their advisors have gathered sufficient data to permit a detailed discussion of individual goals, needs, and interests. These data become the basis for deciding upon such specifics as short and long range courses and experiences, and a projected completion—which is to say graduation—date.

During the eleventh week a copy of the tentative educational plan is again sent to the student's parents for further review. Once approved, it is

forwarded to the principal's office and serves as a basis for monitoring the student's progress. The plan is of course subject to change, and is reviewed and revised at least annually and in most cases more often than that.

Dr. Galloway noted that the development of an individualized education program is not a panacea for all the educational needs of the handicapped child, and that problems are doubtless certain to arise. For example, given the wide variations to be found among students, handicapped and nonhandicapped alike, tailoring instruction to each student's needs may overtax the resources of some schools.

Further, effective implementation requires the involvement of well trained teachers able to accurately assess each individual student's strengths and weaknesses and to help establish individualized educational objectives that relate to measureable behavioral outcomes. Even given an ample supply of teachers who possess these skills, Dr. Galloway said, the lack of reliable diagnostic instruments might preclude a valid prescription of instructional strategies. Research and demonstration activities clearly are needed if this dearth is to be corrected, and, he added, there must also be ample in-service training opportunities to improve the skills of teachers.

Noting that more than half of the enrollment is made up of residential students, the MSSD spokesmen said that the model school is perhaps exceptional in its efforts to introduce the IEP concept into the afterschool life of its students. This individualization was described as beginning with enabling the students to make decisions regarding their living arrangements. There are such options, for example, as residence halls, training apartments, independent apartments at off campus locations, group homes, and community homes. One major component of this effort, they added, is encouraging students to become involved in a wide variety of physical education and recreation activities. These include not only such on-campus activities as roller skating, bowling, and seeing captioned films, but participating in recreation and leisure time programs offered at local community centers.

Though NTID and MSSD are special institutions, with special student bodies and serving special purposes, two propositions emerged from their experiences with the IEP that would seem to bear on school operations generally.

One of these propositions is that effective implementation of the IEP approach not only requires expert, properly trained staff but appropriate backup support by first-rate specialist personnel. The second is that the individual handicapped student's progress is too often slowed by a perhaps well meaning but nevertheless condescending attitude that pictures handicapped children as being far more limited than they actually are.

Overall, in any case, the spokesmen from the two institutions left no doubt of the high regard for the individualized education program concept held at NTID and MSSD, and the conviction that its general application will represent a major step forward in the education of handicapped children.

The Intent of Congress

The importance attached by the Congress to the individualized education program called for in Public Law 94–142 is suggested by the emphasis placed on it in the Act itself, in the Senate and House colloquy prior to the law's enactment, and in special congressional reports.

What the law says

Quoting first from the law itself, section 4(a)(3) provides the following definition:

> *The term "individualized education program" means a written statement for each handicapped child developed in any meeting by a representative of the local educational agency or an intermediate educational unit who shall be qualified to provide, or supervise the provision of, specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of handicapped children, the teacher, the parents or guardian of such child, and, whenever appropriate, such child, which statement shall include (A) a statement of the present levels of educational performance of such child, (B) a statement of annual goals, including short-term instructional objectives, (C) a statement of the specific educational services to be provided to such child, and the extent to which such child will be able to participate in regular educational programs, (D) the projected date for initiation and anticipated duration of such services, and (E) appropriate objective criteria and evaluation procedures and schedules for determining, on at least an annual basis, whether instructional objectives are being achieved.*

Under the heading "Eligibility," section 612 provides that "In order to qualify for assistance under this part in any year, a State shall demonstrate to the Commissioner that the following conditions are met," and in citing those conditions goes on to say—under section 612(4)—that "Each local educational agency in the State will maintain records of the individualized education program for each handicapped child, and such programs shall be established, reviewed, and revised as provided in section 614(a)(5)."

Under section 613, dealing with "State Plans," section 613(a)(11) declares that these plans shall, among other things, "provide for procedures for evaluation at least annually of the effectiveness of programs in meeting the educational needs of handicapped children (including evaluation of individualized education programs), in accordance with such criteria that the Commissioner shall prescribe. . ."

Regarding the review alluded to above in connection with section 612, section 614(a)(5) states that any local education agency or intermediate educational unit that wants to receive funds under the law shall "provide assurances that the local educational agency or intermediate educational unit will establish, or revise, whichever is appropriate, an individualized education program for each handicapped child at the beginning of each school year and will then review and, if appropriate revise, its provisions periodically, but not less than annually."

Comments in the Senate

As reflected in the *Congressional Record*, the debate in the Senate regarding the proposed Education for All Handicapped Children Act was launched with the issuance on June 2, 1975, of Senate Report No. 94–168, prepared by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. On page 4 the report noted that:

> "The bill provides for an individualized planning conference, to be held at least three times a year, involving the parents or guardian, an individual representating the local educational agency qualified to provide special education, the child's teacher and the child when appropriate who will meet jointly to develop and review a written statement describing the educational services to be provided and, when ap-

propriate, to revise such statement with the agreement of the parents."

Then on pages 10 and 11 the report goes into the subject of the IEP more deeply, as follows:

"The Committee bill defines individualized planning conference as a meeting or meetings to be held at least three times a year for the purpose of developing, reviewing, and when appropriate and with the agreement of the parents or guardian, revising a written statement of appropriate educational services to be provided for each handicapped child. The planning conference shall be conducted with the joint participation of the parents or guardian, the child (when appropriate), the child's teacher and a representative of the local educational agency who is qualified to provide or supervise the provision of special education.

"In reviewing the testimony on this bill and after consultation with professionals in the field, the Committee recognizes that in order to derive any benefit to the child, parent, and teacher an individualized planning conference must be held a minimum of three times per year. The frequent monitoring of a handicapped child's progress throughout the year is the most useful tool in designing an educational program for not only the child but those who are responsible for his management in school and at home.

"There is evidence that an individualized planning conference on an annual basis is insufficient. It is the Committee's intent in requiring that individualized planning conferences be provided for each handicapped child that these conferences be utilized as an extension of the procedural protections guaranteed under existing law to parents of handicapped children, and that they be the logical extension and the final step of the evaluation and placement process.

"They are not intended to be the evaluation process itself. Thus, it is the intent of this provision that local educational agencies involve the parent at the beginning of and at other times during the year regarding the provision of specific services and short-term instructional objectives for the special education of the handicapped child, which services are specifically designed to meet the child's individual needs and problems. The Committee views this process as a method of involving the parent and the handicapped child in the provision of appropriate services, providing parent counseling as to ways to bolster the educational process at home, and providing parents with a written statement of what the school intends to do for the handicapped child.

"It is not the Committee's intention that the written statement developed at the individual planning conferences be construed as creating a contractual relationship. Rather, the Committee intends to ensure adequate involvement of the parents or guardian of the handicapped child, and the child (when appropriate) in both the statement and its subsequent review and revision. The Committee has included a requirement that any revision of the statement be done only with the agreement of the parents or guardian in order to ensure that services to the child are not arbitrarily curtailed or modified.

"During the hearings on this bill, the Committee received testimony that the individualized written educational plan (as contained in the bill introduced in January) would require school systems to develop an expertise and ability to provide services guaranteed to assure educational progress. The Committee recognizes that in many instances the process of providing special education and related services to handicapped children is not guaranteed to produce any particular outcome. By changing the language of this provision to emphasize the process of parent and child involvement and to provide a written record of reasonable expectations, the Committee intends to clarify that such individualized planning conferences are a way to provide parent involvement and protection to assure that appropriate services are provided to a handicapped child. The Committee has deleted the language of the bill as introduced which required objective criteria and evaluation procedures by which to assure that the short term instructional goals were met. Instead it has required the Commissioner of Education to conduct a comprehensive study of objective criteria and evaluation procedures which may be utilized at a later date in conjunction with individualized data available through the individualized planning conference to de-

termine the effectiveness of special education and related services being provided.

"The Committee further points out that it intends that a copy of the statement thus developed be retained on file within the school district with copies provided to parents and others involved subject to strict procedures for protection of confidentiality. While it believes that such statements may be useful to a State educational agency for purposes of audit and evaluation, it does not intend that such records be forwarded to the State agency, but be available for inspection."

Several pages later the report added that the law

". . .requires that the State assure that local educational agencies provide and maintain records of the individualized planning conference for each handicapped child including the written statement developed from the conferences, and that such conferences will be conducted at least three times a year to develop, review and, with the agreement of the parents or guardian, revise the statement. Fifth, the bill requires that the State educational agency be responsible for insuring the implementation of and compliance with provisions of the Act, and for the general supervision of educational programs for handicapped children within the State, including all such education programs administered by any other State or local agency. Finally, to assure orderly due process with regard to carrying out the provisions of the Act and to assure compliance with provisions of the Act, the Committee bill provides that the State shall establish policies and procedures to provide consultation with persons involved in or concerned ith the education of handicapped children including handicapped individuals and parents of handicapped children. Further, in this regard, the State shall establish an entity to assure compliance with the provisions of the Act which shall conduct periodic evaluation and be empowered to receive, and take such necessary steps as are required, to resolve complaints of violations of the requirements of the Act."

In its final reference to the IEP the report notes that

"The Committee has designed the individualized planning conferences as one method to prevent labelling or misclassification. Furthermore, the Committee points out that due process requirements in existing law were designed specifically to protect against this abuse, and should be examined by the Commissioner and the State educational agency to assure that they are effective in this regard."

Subsequent to the issuance of this report, on June 8, the debate got underway with remarks by Senator Jennings Randolph of West Virginia, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on the Handicapped. In analyzing the various provisions of the proposed Act—at that time referred to as S. 6—Senator Randolph noted that

"A feature of the measure that will promote the educational development of handicapped children is the individualized planning conference. It has long been recognized by educators that individualized attention to a child brings rich rewards to the child, his teachers, and family. Handicapped children have been a neglected minority in our school system; individualized planning conferences are a way of targeting the resources of our school systems on handicapped children. These conferences are to be held at least three times a year and will represent a cooperative effort on the part of the school, the parents, and the child himself, when appropriate, to meet the unique educational needs of the child. Frequent monitoring of a handicapped child's progress throughout the school year is a vital component of the individualized planning conference. Preliminary evidence on annual planning conferences indicates that the usefulness of the individualized planning conference would be nullified if held only on an annual basis."

Senator Robert T. Stafford of Vermont then spoke about the makeup of the planning conferences, noting that

"The participants will include the parents, the teacher, and a qualified supervisor or provider of special education services. This provision is extremely important if the child's progress is to be adequately monitored and if appropriate

steps are to be taken to assure that the problems with the educational process that the child is having are met in a timely and consistent way. An additional benefit that will result from these conferences is one that is too often overlooked. Not only will the child be better served, and the parents better informed of the limitations their child has due to a particular handicap, but the teacher will learn from this experience as well.

"As we look more and more toward children with handicaps being educated with their normal peers, we must realize, and try to alleviate, the burden put upon the teacher who must cope with that child and all the others in the class as well. The teacher needs reinforcement and a better understanding of the child's abilities and disabilities.

"It is hoped that participation in these conferences will have a positive effect on the attitude of the teacher toward the child, and an understanding of the child's problems in relating to his or her peers because of a handicapping condition."

Commented Senator Randolph:

"Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont explained one feature of this bill, and I will try to emphasize his point. We will promote the educational development of handicapped children through the process of individualized planning conferences.

"What the Senator has stated is very important. Educators generally have begun to realize that some personal attention must be given to a child. I am sure that the child is the better for it. Individual attention is one of the benefits of a good education in institutions of learning for all the people of the United States, not only the handicapped.

"Throughout this country, our schools, colleges, and universities long have stressed the need for individual attention to students. It is the heart of our educational process and it has stood the test of time.

"Perhaps this is not the occasion to mention it, but I do so. I look back upon my school days, and I say to the Senator from Vermont that I recall those teachers who not only were informed, but also were inspiring. They were those men and women who gave of their time a little after the class actually had closed. They gave one the opportunity to come and talk with them. They were there to counsel the students. In a sense, that can be carried over into the specific that the Senator mentioned here—the individual attention to children.

"The individual planning conference is a cooperative effort. It is an effort that must include the teacher, the representative of the local educational agency, the parents, and, when appropriate, the boy or girl who is handicapped. When we do this, we have the opportunity to keep in touch with that child. We monitor the child's progress, as one might say, and that frequent monitoring is a vital component of this training planning conference process. It helps the child, it helps the parents or guardian, and it helps the teachers.

"For these reasons, I comment on what the Senator has said."

Subsequently, following a discussion regarding other provisions of the bill, Senator Williams had this further comment about the IEP:

"In order to involve the parent and the child—when appropriate—in the educational process so that they may fully participate in making decisions regarding their child's education, S. 6 provides for an individualized planning conference, to be held at least three times a year, involving the parents or guardian, a person representing the local educational agency qualified to provide special education, the child's teacher and the child, when appropriate. These persons will meet jointly to develop and review a written statement describing the educational services to be provided for the particular child and, when appropriate, the statement will be revised with the agreement of the parents.

"This conference is intended also to serve as a method of providing additional parent counseling and training so that the parent may bolster the educational process at home. This involvement is particularly important in order to assure that the educational services are meeting the child's needs and so that both parents and child may be part of the process from which they are so often far removed. The conference is not a contractual relationship, but rather a cooperative effort. It serves to fully extend the

procedural protections and parent involvement which was initiated last year in the Education Amendments of 1974."

In a query addressed to Senator Randolph, Senator Richard B. Stone of Florida said:

"There is a question which has been raised by some of my constituents concerning the individualized planning conferences.

"Was it the committee's intent that these planning conferences be held three times a year and attended by a small group of persons for the purpose of developing a plan for each child, or was the intent to hold a large meeting three times a year to draw plans for many children?"

Responded Senator Randolph:

"In answer to my colleague, it was the intent, and I believe I can speak for the subcommittee and the committee in this matter, that these meetings to which the Senator makes reference be small meetings; that is, confined to those persons who have, naturally, an intense interest in a particular child, i.e., the parent or parents of the child, and in some cases, the guardian of the child. Certainly, the teacher involved or even more than one teacher would be included. In addition, there should be a representative of the local educational agency who is qualified to provide, or supervise the provision of, specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of handicapped children.

"These are the persons that we thought might well be included. That is why we have called them individualized planning conferences. We believe that they are worthwhile, and we discussed this very much as we drafted the legislation.

"We thought they should be held three times a year because we have the belief that a lesser number of such conferences would not be productive.

"If the child is not progressing as he or she should, it would be best to identify the problem as quickly as possible. Then we would have the opportunity of correcting the difficulty before a long period of time goes by. Sometimes we bring into focus the needs of a child simply by discussion of his problems.

"We believe, as I said in my opening statement, that frequent monitoring of the child's educational development is certainly valid."

Regarding the burden that might arise from the IEP requirement, Senator Jacob Javits of New York expressed reservation about

". . .the dynamics by which the local educational agencies handle a three-times-a-year planning conference for each handicapped child, and a written record. I do not think there can be any objection against maintaining a written record. We do that for every student anyhow.

"As to the three-times-a-year conference, I believe we ought to think about that. That is a lot. It is 21 million conferences. . . . If there is any amendment addressing this issue, we will deal with it, and if there is not, we will probably deal with it anyhow in the House-Senate conference.

"As to the general requirements of the State entity, the amendment which Senator Dole will introduce, in which I very much wish to join, will deal with that situation, so I hope it should obviate reasonable objection to that proposition."

The observations by Senator Javits led to the following colloquy involving him and Senators Randolph, Stafford, Williams, and Robert J. Dole of Kansas:

Mr. DOLE. It was the intent of the Senator from Kansas to offer an amendment which would either delete the planning conference or at least to make it discretionary, because it just seems to me, as I have indicated earlier, if we are going to hold at least 3 times a year an individualized planning conference for everyone who is handicapped, according to the definitions of this act, that is going to be about 24 million conferences and 24 million pieces of paper. That could be an administrative nightmare.

Now the Senator from Kansas understands the problem of the handicapped to some degree. There may be some who need 10 conferences or more per year, there may be some who need one. It would seem to the Senator from Kansas that one thing that we could do between now and October 1976 would be to conduct a pilot program, that has been suggested, in the States of Texas, Florida, and Wisconsin, where they have ongoing programs or at least could have a pilot program to see if a nationwide program were appropriate.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. What is being done in the State of Kansas on this matter?

Mr. DOLE. We allow the State agency to have as many conferences as they want. I do not believe we require any certain number of conferences. As this Senator understands, the purpose is to sit down with parent or guardian and if appropriate, the handicapped individual and establish a clear and meaningful plan.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The only reason I come back to Kansas is because that is the State represented by the Senator and sometimes if we look at our own situation we assess it in view of the national needs. As I understand, these conferences for handicapped persons are held about once a month at the medical center.

Mr. DOLE. But I do not think the number of meetings—whether it be an individual conference once a month or once a year—is set by law or otherwise made inflexible.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There is a file on every handicapped child, starting with an evaluation following right through diagnosis and service. I think this is correct.

Mr. DOLE. This may be technically correct but as far as the conferences, I do not think we have been discussing this but have been discussing whether the number of conferences should be set in law by the Federal Government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. What is being done in some Kansas programs is what we want to do in other States.

Mr. DOLE. Right.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator can understand that. I would hope in this instance that the Senator would not press for this amendment, but let it be a part of the discussion here today. We shall give very careful study to this in the future.

Mr. DOLE. The Senator from Kansas does not quarrel with the conference. This Senator does not quarrel with whether it is 3 or 6 or 9 or 12, but again it is a Federal dictation to a State agency that they must comply; they must have at least three individual conferences. And later on in the bill there are other sections where the States must have statistically valid data based on these individual conferences.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I add further to the Senator, this is only if they desire to participate.

Mr. DOLE. If they do not want to participate in the program, they would not be so constrained.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct.

Mr. DOLE. But the Senator from Kansas is trying to figure out some way that, before we launch into this massive effort, we have some history. And since the Senator from Washington has delayed the effective date until October 1976, it would seem to me that we should make some legislative history that HEW should conduct a pilot program in at least three States, and maybe Kansas would be a good State.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is presently being done by DHEW. There are projects in Florida and in Texas. Let us remember that we have adequate time until October 1, 1976 to see the results of these studies, which I feel will prove that this provision will be beneficial.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I commend that, too. I was going to modify an amendment to make it annual so that we do not start out quite so tough.

Also Senator Randolph has now defined in the Stone amendment the matter of the conference and that, therefore, somewhat relieves the strains. Somewhere between one and three we ought to be able to let the matter move from here and strike a fair balance. My suggestion, because I know how strongly Senator Randolph feels about it, to Senator Dole would be to make it twice. In other words, instead of three times, make it twice with the understanding that the pilot work is being done and that seasonably, before the operative date, we will review the figure of two. Then at least you have a mandate which is one-third less, and we have committed ourselves to reducing even further depending upon the actual work of the HEW. I think that is probably the best way.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the Senator from Kansas permit me to comment on the words of the Senator from New York.

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would rather not have it

twice, for the reason that the Senate works with. . .

Mr. DOLE. The House has one conference in their bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I will agree. I will be a conferee, Senator Randolph will be a conferee, and Senator Stafford will be a conferee. I think the Senator should leave it to us, with the legislative record, and he has our feet to the fire. He has agreed to listen to the House and give attention to the findings where the words are being experimented with.

Mr. DOLE. I have no quarrel with that. If all these studies should prove that there is really no benefit from the individualized conferences, whether they are 2 or 10 or whatever number.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would be ready to amend it.

Mr. DOLE. That is what I am seeking.

Mr. JAVITS. I make the same commitment.

Mr. DOLE. The Senator does not wish to impose any burden on educators, or parents, or handicapped children that does not benefit the handicapped.

Mr. RANDOLPH. No Member of the Senate is more concerned about the handicapped than is the Senator from Kansas. He has been a leader in this field. All of us working on these matters want to do one job, and that is to benefit the handicapped—in this particular instance, the education of the handicapped.

Mr. DOLE. That satisfies me. My concern is that we make every resource, or as much as possible, available to the direct activities and the direct programs that are going to benefit the handicapped.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think that one of the greatest benefits that can come to the handicapped child is to have the parents brought into this conference, because the education of the child continues after the school doors close and that child is at home. This is part of the educational process. That is one of the reasons why we have developed the idea of the mandatory conference, to make sure that the parent is part of the education of the child. We have to have more than one, it seems to me. That is almost a "get acquainted" meeting, and a followup meeting is essential. I support the three meetings that Senator Randolph put into this bill, and I hope we can keep it at that, at this point.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, as the ranking member, I pledge to Senator Dole to pay the most serious attention to the findings of the work which will be done in the interim until the new operative date. As will Senator Randolph, I will be perfectly willing to advocate even its entire omission, if we are convinced that it is a drag instead of an aid to everything that is being done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is an absolute promise to do that, because the ends are what we are interested in here. We want to see the best possible approach to education. We will be watching very closely during this period to see how it develops, particularly in the area that the Senator from Kansas has brought forth.

Mr. DOLE. I appreciate the assurances from the Senators from New York, West Virginia, and New Jersey. Their concern for the handicapped is genuine, as is that of the Senator from Kansas. But hopefully we do not want to burden some State agency with a requirement that may prove to be counterproductive. Based on the assurances, the Senator from Kansas will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, while assurances are being given, I would like to join my three colleagues in offering the same assurance on that.

Mr. DOLE. I appreciate that. It means a great deal to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The final comments on the IEP during this phase of the debate were offered by Senators Alan Cranston of California and Walter F. Mondale of Minnesota.

Said Senator Cranston:

"S. 6 as reported also would add a new provision that establishes procedures to insure that handicapped children and their parents or guardians are given an opportunity to participate in the planning and development of the educational program, including the assessment of the handicapped child's present educational performance, the specification of instructional objectives, and identification of the specific educational services to be provided.

"Mr. President, there are many other significant provisions in S. 6. I am particularly pleased with the specific guarantees of due process of law provided for handicapped children and their parents in all matters relevant to identification, evaluation, and placement, and the prohibition against the classification of children in a manner which promotes racial or cultural discrimination."

Added Senator Mondale:

"This bill represents a major step toward the identification and education of all handicapped youngsters in the near future. In the past, many children have been simply placed in institutions or segregated in schools and classes with little emphasis on adequate education and training. Under S. 6, an individual planning conference, will provide a tailored program for each handicapped youngster to meet his special educational needs.

"In the past, many children have been left to sit at home, providing little opportunity for adequate training and development. Under S. 6, priority is given to provision of a free appropriate public education to children not currently receiving any, as well as those currently receiving inadequate assistance.

"In the long run our whole society will benefit by timely, effective identification and treatment of the needs of those individuals and their families."

Comments from the House of Representatives

Meanwhile the House Education and Labor Committee was busy preparing a report on its companion bill, H.R. 7217. Issued on June 26 and labeled No. 94–332, the report says the following (on page 13) about the individualized education program:

Why does the bill provide for prescription of an individualized education program?

The movement toward the individualization of instruction, involving the participation of the child and the parent, as well as all relevant educational professionals, is a trend gaining ever wider support in educational, parental, and political groups throughout the Nation.

Therefore, this legislation would require each local educational agency to develop with a child's teacher in consultation with the parents of the child (and in appropriate instances the child) an individualized education program. Such a prescription responds to 3 fundamental tenets:

(a) each child requires an educational plan that is tailored to achieve his or her maximum potential;

(b) all principals in the child's educational environment, including the child, should have the opportunity for input in the development of an individualized program of instruction;

(c) individualization means specifics and timetables for those specifics, and the need for periodic review of those specifics—all of which produce greatly enhanced fiscal and educational accountability.

Parenthetically, it may be noted that the 93rd Congress, and, more specifically, this Committee, have already expressed their concern about the need for increased individualization in at least 2 public laws: Public Law 93–112, the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1973, and Public Law 93–380, the Education Amendments of 1974 (Title I).

Then five pages later the report adds this:

H.R. 7217 defines "individualized education program" as an educational plan for each handicapped child developed jointly by the local educational agency and an appropriate teacher, in consultation with the parents. This plan would contain a statement of the present levels of educational performance of the child, desired instructional objectives, a statement of the specific educational services provided the child, and the extent to which the child will be able to participate in regular educational programs, a projected date for initiation and anticipated duration of such services, and an annual evaluation of the procedures and objectives.

Agreeing on the bill's IEP provisions

In the subsequent debate on the House floor, as recorded in the *Congressional Record*, Representative John Brademas of Indiana commented as follows regarding the IEP:

"Mr. Chairman, we also provide that an individualized plan of instruction must be provided for each handicapped child and evaluated at least annually. Individualized plans are of great

importance in the education of handicapped children in order to help them develop their full potential."

Representative Albert H. Quie of Minnesota also discussed the IEP, noting that the bill

> ". . .includes a requirement for the development of individualized education programs for each handicapped child. This would be an educational plan which is developed jointly by the local education agencies, a teacher involved with the specific education of the handicapped child, and his parents or guardian. The plan would include a statement of the child's present level of educational performance, a statement of the goals to be achieved, a statement of the specific services which will have to be provided, a projected date for initiation and duration of the services, and criteria and evaluation procedures for determining whether the objectives are being met. Because handicapped children are unique, setting up plans for each one makes good sense and by involving the parents in the development of such plans, the benefits begun in school hopefully would be continued at home. It is important to point out that it is an educational plan developed jointly, but it is not intended as a binding contract by the schools, children, and parents."

Conference Report

Although the two measures subsequently passed by the Senate and the House were alike in their broad outlines, they differed in detail. Thus it was necessary to appoint a conference committee, composed of representatives of each branch of the Congress, to work out the differences. Out of those deliberations came House of Representatives Conference Report No. 94–664, which says on pages 30 and 31:

> The Senate bill and the House amendments add to the definitions in the Education of the Handicapped Act a definition of individualized instructional planning for each handicapped child which includes a statement of the child's present level of educational performance, statement of the instructional objectives to be achieved, statement of the specific educational services to be provided to the child, the extent to which the child will participate in the regular educational program, and the projected date for initiation and anticipated duration of such services.
>
> The Senate bill designates this individualized instructional planning as an "individualized planning conference"; the House amendments designate the planning as an "individualized education program." The Senate recedes.
>
> The Senate bill provides that the individualized planning conference is a meeting or meetings for the purpose of developing a written statement; the House amendments provide that the individualized education program is an educational plan. The House recedes.
>
> The Senate bill provides that the written statement shall be developed by a representative of the local educational agency, the teacher, the parents or guardian of the handicapped child and the child when appropriate; the House amendments provide that the educational plan shall be developed jointly by the local educational agency and an appropriate teacher *in consultation with* the parents or guardian of the child, and the child, whenever appropriate. The House recedes.
>
> The Senate bill, but not the House amendments, provides that the representatives of the local educational agency shall be qualified to provide, or supervise the provision of, specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of the child. The House recedes.
>
> The Senate bill provides for a statement of *short-term* instructional objectives; the House amendments provide for a statement of *desired* objectives.
>
> The conference substitute provides that the individualized educational program shall include a statement of the annual goals and short-term objectives to be achieved by the child. It is intended that each individual handicapped child will have an educational program which states the annual goals as well as including short-term instructional objectives to be achieved within shorter time perods.
>
> The House amendments, but not the Senate bill, provide that the individualized instructional planning shall include objective criteria and evaluation procedures and schedules for

determining, on at least an annual basis, whether instructional objectives are being met.

The Senate recedes with an amendment specifying that such objective criteria and evaluation procedures shall be "appropriate." The conferees intend that this amendment clarify that any criteria and evaluation procedures used are to be consistent with the requirements regarding testing and evaluation procedures in existing law.

The conferees further clarify that it is not intended that the individualized educational programs be forwarded to the U.S. Office of Education or the State educational agency. The individualized educational programs are intended to be retained in the local educational agency. Where inspection or review of such programs may be useful to the Office of Education or State educational agency for purposes of audit or evaluation, it is intended that such activities take place within the local agency, subject to strict procedures for the protection of confidentiality.

The House amendments, but not the Senate bill, add to the Education of the Handicapped Act, a definition of *public educational agency* defining such agency as any State educational agency or any other public agency approved by a State educational agency to provide special education and related services to handicapped children within the State involved. The conference substitute includes a definition of intermediate educational unit, defining such term as any public authority established by State law for the purpose of providing free public education on a regional level within the State which provides special education and related services to handicapped children within that State and which is not a local educational authority but which is under the general supervision of the State educational agency. The conferees include this definition in order to cover certain unique situations in States where public bodies established by State law provide special education and related services for handicapped children, but where the definition of local educational agency does not necessarily apply, e.g., intermediate units in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Generally, the term "intermediate educational unit" is used throughout the conference report wherever the term "local educational agency" is also used.

Requirements for individualized planning conference. The Senate bill requires that the State give assurances to the Commissioner that each local educational agency in the State will maintain records of the individualized planning conference, including the written statement developed pursuant to such conference, and that such conference shall be held at least three times each year to develop, review, and, when appropriate, and with the agreement of the parents, revise such statements. The House amendments require the local educational agency in its application to provide satisfactory assurance that it will maintain the individualized program for each child, and will review the program at least annually, and revise its provisions in consultation with the parents or guardians.

The conference substitute requires that the State give assurances as a condition of eligibility that each local educational agency will maintain records of the individualized education program for each handicapped child, and to provide assurances that each local educational agency within the State shall establish, review and revise such program consistent with requirements on local educational agencies under the local application provisions of the Act.

The conference substitute also requires each local educational agency to provide assurances that it will establish, or revise, whichever is appropriate, an individualized education program for each handicapped child at the beginning of each school year and will then review and, if appropriate revise, the provisions of such program periodically, but not less than annually. In the initial year of a handicapped child's participation in a program of free appropriate public education the individualized education program shall be established at the beginning of the school year and reviewed at least once during that year. Thereafter, the conferees intend that this provision requires at least one annual review of the child's individualized education program.

The conferees have defined the individualized education program as a written statement (including the educational status of the child, the annual goals and short-term in-

structional objectives, and specific educational services to be provided) for each handicapped child which is jointly developed by the local educational agency, the teacher, the parents, and the child, whenever appropriate. It is intended that *all* parties (the local educational agency, the teacher, the parents, and the child, whenever appropriate) will be involved throughout the process of establishment, review and revision of this program.

Concluding debate—House

In the House following the issue of the conference report, the remarks of Representative Brademas included the following:

"Mr. Speaker, the conference bill, as did the House version, requires the development of an individualized written education program for every handicapped child served, to be designed initially in consultation with parents or guardian, and to be reviewed and revised as necessary at least annually."

To which Representative Quie added the following:

"Not only have we guaranteed (handicapped children) a right to an education, but I think we have written adequate provisions which will protect those rights and guarantee that a child will not be improperly labeled or improperly placed in an educational setting which will not suit his or her unique educational needs. The bill further guarantees that each handicapped child will have an individualized program which is designed to meet his or her special needs. As you know, not every handicapped child is the same; and by designing educational programs which specifically address specific needs and problems, I believe that handicapped children will benefit more from our educational programs. One of the reasons why I feel so strongly that the individualized education program will be so beneficial is that we require that it be developed with the involvement of a child's parent or guardian. By having a child, the parent, and his or her teacher involved in planning, it is my belief that the end result has to be positive."

Concluding debate—Senate

In the Senate following the issuance of the conference report, Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of New Jersey, said the proposed law "assures the individualization of the educational process by requiring an individualized education program tailored to the unique needs of each handicapped child," and subsequently added:

"The provisions requiring an individualized education program for each handicapped child are extremely important protections to the parents and child, and highly necessary to proper planning and programming for the school district. Under the conference agreement, a local educational agency or intermediate unit receiving assistance must assure that this provision is carried out for the handicapped children within their jurisdictions, and the State is required to provide assurances that the program is carried out for all other handicapped children within the State. The Senate bill required a conference to be held at least three times a year for developing, reviewing and revising the plan, in order to assure that changes were made in the plan as appropriate to the child throughout the school year, while the House bill required that this occur on an annual basis. Once again, the conference substitute represents the essence of compromise. For under the conference agreement, this program must be established or revised, whichever is appropriate, for each handicapped child at the beginning of the school year, and must then be reviewed, and if appropriate, revised periodically during the school year, but not less than annually.

"The conferees have further defined the individualized education program as a written statement—including the educational status of the child, the annual goals and short-term instructional objectives, and specific educational services to be provided—for each handicapped child which is jointly developed by the local educational agency, the teacher, the parents, and the child. It is intended that all parties will be involved throughout the process of establishment, review and revision of this program."

Said Senator Stafford:

"The Senate passed bill contained a provision for three individualized planning conferences for each child each year. These conferences were to include, but not necessarily be limited to the teacher, the parent or guardian, a representative of the educational agency responsible

for the child's education, and the child when appropriate.

"The conference agreement changes the name of such conferences to an individualized educational program, but retains in the definitional sense much of the Senate language. The difference is the way in which it will operate. The agreement clearly specifies that there will be two conferences in the first year of the handicapped child's schooling and provides that it will be reviewed at least annually. I wish to point out, however, that the conference clearly did not wish to preclude more than one conference per year.

"The conferees recognize that each child is affected in a different way by a handicap. Some may be more severe for some children than they would be for others. We want to encourage as many conferences a year as any one child may need. It is felt that in some cases numerous conferences would be desired. We did not preclude that possibility."

Concluding the debate, on November 19 Senator Randolph again emphasized that the agreed-upon version of the law

". . .calls for the development of an individualized educational program for each handicapped child, in which there is participation by the parents or guardian of the child, the teacher, a representative of the local educational agency qualified to provide or supervise the provision of special education and related services, and the child when appropriate. Individualized attention to educational needs has and will continue to be one of the most important elements to a child's success in school. By monitoring a child's progress, a teacher can aid the child in achieving educational goals as well as determining where a potential educational problem may arise."

Status of the Committee's 1976 Recommendations

In preparing its annual reports each year the National Advisory Committee has made it a practice to examine the status of the recommendations it had advanced 12 months earlier. The following, based on a presentation by Dr. Edwin Martin, Jr., Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, summarizes what has happened as regards the recommendations contained in the Committee's report for 1976.

1. That all concerned—specifically including the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, State departments of education, special education associations, and other professional organizations, teacher training institutions, and the research community—make the concept of "the least restrictive environment" a priority concern in their discussions, study, planning, funding, and allocations of effort, toward developing techniques, strategies, and practices that will make this concept a standard and universal element in the operations of the Nation's schools.

The concept of "the least restrictive environment" has become one of the most thoroughly reviewed and widely discussed aspects of P.L. 94–142—as part of the deliberations of the Bureau staff and outside personnel involved in the development of proposed rules regarding the law's implementation, and in a wide range of other activities, including the following:

The Office of Education (OE) contracted with the Council for Exceptional Children to develop three mediated tape-slide presentations for use in describing the significance and implications of P.L. 94–142 (one geared to parents, one for general audiences, and one for administrators). Five hundred copies of these packets have been disseminated to State education agencies and major national parent organizations and advocate groups.

More than 1,000 letters were sent to consumer/advocate agencies to provide them with copies of the law and the Congressional Conference Report, and to inform them about proposed public conferences on the law.

OE conducted or participated in approximately 20 public meetings about the law on both a geographic and special interest basis. Approximately 2,200 people participated in these meetings, and several hundred responses were received.

OE convened a national writing group of approximately 170 people—composed of parents, advocates, handicapped persons, representatives of special interest groups (e.g., AFT, NEA, private schools), and administrators of State and local programs—to develop concept papers on the major topics in the law, the "least restrictive environment" being one of them.

Subsequent to the issuance of proposed rules regarding "the least restrictive environment" and other aspects of P.L. 94–142, OE held a series of six regional meetings to receive public comments and suggestions regarding the proposed regulations. Among other things, these regulations make the following points;

(a) That each handicapped child's educational placement must be determined at least annually and be based on his or her individualized education program.

(b) That steps be taken to assure that implementation of this provision will not produce a harmful effect on the child or reduce the quality of services which he or she required.

(c) When there is evidence to suggest that a local educational agency is placing its handicapped children in an environment without regard to their specific, individual needs, the State educational agency must assist in planning and implementing any necessary corrective action.

2. That the Governors and legislatures of the several States join forces in making sure that educational services are authorized, and provided, for every handicapped child in their States, beginning at the child's birth, and that the

Commissioner of Education lend his active support to the achievement of this goal.

As matters now stand, 30 States have laws that permit local districts to institute early intervention into the education of handicapped children, and 13 others have laws making such intervention mandatory. These laws vary widely with respect to the age of the children served and in the degree to which they extend coverage to all handicapped children rather than only to some.

Advocacy groups, professionals, legislators, and others who are seeking to strengthen and expand such legislation have been given major impetus by the Incentive Grant section of P.L. 94–142, which is specifically designed to stimulate the further development of education programs for children between the ages of 3 and 5. The Incentive Grant program was launched in FY 77 with an allocation of $12.5 million. Every State has applied for services under the program, a response interpreted by many as presaging a major move toward making preschool education for all handicapped children a standard feature of the Nation's education system.

3. That Adult and Continuing Education officials in the U.S. Office of Education, together with officials of the department of education and other relevant agencies within the States, launch special studies of their present programs toward accommodating those programs to the needs of students with disabilities; that the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped seek ways of applying its resources to help Adult and Continuing Education systems provide programs of specific use and benefit to handicapped learners; and that Congress examine current Federal legislation bearing on Adult and Continuing Education and Special Education toward determining whether new provisions may be necessary to enable handicapped and nonhandicapped persons alike to enjoy the benefits of life-long learning.

During the most recent legislative revision of the Higher Education Act a new section was included on life-long learning. There is a clear intent in this legislation that the handicapped be included in the benefits of life-long learning experiences. As with all new legislative authority, time will be required to digest the law and to develop appropriate rules and regulations. Staff from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped and the Bureau of Postsecondary Education have been working together to assure that handicapped persons receive a proper place in this program.

Also involved has been a task force jointly formed by the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education and the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped to coordinate the efforts of the Office of Education in Adult and Continuing Education. Its work has included efforts to coordinate personnel preparation in the areas of adult, continuing, vocational, and technical education, to co-sponsor national and regional leadership development activities, to analyze the needs for in-service and pre-service training of personnel, and to coordinate State level personnel development and planning between vocational and special education.

The overall plan includes an agreement between BEH and BOAE to make the cross-linkage between these two fields formal, visible, planned, and co-functional, with all activities being coordinated between the two Bureaus. Meanwhile the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has developed for its own staff members a project officer's resource manual which provides a guide for all areas of the professional staff in adult, continuing, and vocational education.

Expectations are that these efforts will expand significantly, and in fact the BEH Divisions of Personnel Preparation, Media Services, and Innovation and Development have now awarded grants and contracts in these areas, as part of the effort to achieve the Bureau's objective of assuring handicapped people in continuing education.

4. That the U.S. Commissioner of Education and the Chief State School Officer of each State join in a meeting convened by the Commissioner for the purposes of examining the provisions of the new Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94–142), determining responsibilities and strategies for the Act's implementation, and developing the framework for continued cooperation.

Under the leadership of the BEH Office of the Deputy Commissioner and the Director of the Division of Assistance to States, a series of meetings was arranged with the Governors' offices and the Nation's Chief State School Officers to explain the provisions and intent of P.L. 94–142. Subsequently a consortium of interstate agencies

was formed to address policy issues involved in the Act's implementation. Agencies represented in this consortium include the National Governors' Conference, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Association of State Boards of Education, the Education Commission of the States, and the Institute for Educational Leadership of the George Washington University. The consortium has by now sponsored a number of conferences attended by representatives from Governor's offices, State legislatures, State boards of education, State education agencies, and State advocacy groups for the handicapped.

In addition, OE funded a proposal by the American Association of School Administrators to organize and conduct 10 regional conferences on P.L. 94–142, aimed at explaining the administrative implication of the Act to local practitioners and to provide a forum for the discussion of relevant implementation issues by local superintendents and other administrators, and appropriate State and Federal agency representatives.

5. That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Commissioner of Education, and the Congress consider the staff allocation situation in the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped and provide for sufficient additional positions to enable the Bureau to implement P.L. 94–142 in the fashion that Congress intended and that the interests of the Nation's handicapped children and their parents compel.

By the beginning of this year the staff of the Bureau had been raised to 170, an increase of 35 people over the 1976 total. Three of the four Division Directors were in place and providing active leadership, and recruitment efforts were underway for a Director of the Division of Media Services. Meanwhile efforts were launched to secure 40 additional positions for the Division of Assistance to States, with some to be located in the HEW Regional Offices. These new staff members would work closely with the Office for Civil Rights to assure that States and local education agencies were in compliance with Section 504 of P.L. 93–112 as it relates to P.L. 94–142.

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1977 O-233-028